

URBAN DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: June 22, 2022

TIME: 3:00 pm

PLACE: Webex

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE URBAN DESIGN PANEL:

Brian Wakelin (Chair)
Alan Boniface
Peeroj Thakre
Geoff Lister (excused from item 3)
Brittany Coughlin (excused from item 3)
Jesse Gregson (excused from item 2 & 3)
Jane Vordrodt (excused from item 1 & 2)
Scott Romses (excused from item 1 & 2)

REGRETS:

Amina Yasin
Jennifer Stamp
Adrien Rahbar

RECORDING SECRETARY: M.Sem

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1. 5812-5844 Cambie Street
 2. 622-688 SW Marine Drive
 3. 1477 W Broadway
-

BUSINESS MEETING Chair, MR.WAKELIN, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted the presence of a quorum.

1. **Address:** 5812-5844 Cambie Street
Permit No.: DP-2022-00210
Description: To develop a mixed-use project comprised of a 12-storey office tower and a 33-storey market residential tower containing 269 strata units, both over a four-storey podium with retail at grade. Public benefits include a 37-space child care and a youth centre; all over Six levels of underground parking with vehicular access from the rear lane. Total FSR is 10.16. Building heights are 150 ft. (north tower) and 330 ft. (south tower).
Zoning: CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: First (as DP)
Architect: IBI Group
Delegation: Martin Bruckner
 Jeffrey Mok
 Daryl Tyke

Staff: Omar Aljebouri

EVALUATION: 5812-5844 Cambie Street (DP) - Support with recommendations (5/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Development Planner Omar Aljebouri presented the project as follows:

Intro and Overview

- This is a Development Permit application following rezoning under the Cambie Corridor Plan.
- It is a mixed-use development consisting of a 33-storey market residential tower and a 12-storey commercial tower over a four-storey all-commercial podium and includes rooftop amenities.
- A 37-space turn-key childcare centre on the podium.
- An approximately 5,800 sq. ft. turn-key youth centre.
- An approximately 3,200 sq. ft. public plaza.
- On November 25, 2021, Council approved the form of development which defines the project's height, density and general massing. The DP application is returning to the Panel to discuss design refinements, specifically to the public realm and building articulation.

The Neighbourhood and Context

- This full city block site is located east of Cambie St, between 42nd and 43rd Avenues.
- The Cambie Corridor Plan envisions the blocks between 39th and 45th Avenues to form a new commercial and employment core.
- This site will mark 43rd Avenue as a new commercial street spanning between Cambie St and Columbia Park and will accommodate the tallest tower east of Cambie Street.

Built Form

- The Plan envisions a strong and clearly defined commercial podium punctuated with vertical towers.
- Indoor and outdoor amenities to be provided atop the towers and the podium, for both residential and commercial uses.
- Playful architectural expressions are encouraged to mark the importance of this node.
- Commercial lanes should provide visual interest by creating engaging facades that soften the utility functions; setbacks will accommodate pedestrian movement within the lane.

Public Realm

- A public plaza is located at the south edge of the site and is complemented by a similar one across 43rd Ave. The Plan envisions the plaza as an informal gathering space that responds to a local context, reinforces the neighbourhood character, and accommodates up to 400 people.
- It is intended to have quality paving, furnishings, lighting, and landscaping.
- Some potential design elements include:
 - Customized furniture and seat walls
 - Trees and planting that frame the plaza
 - Integrate public art; water features; interactive and wayfinding elements; lighting.

UDP Concerns at Rezoning

- Strengthening the legibility of the plaza and building entries; a stronger relationship between the plaza and the youth centre.
- A stronger youth centre presence.
- Simplification of the design elements.
- Enhancing the relationship between the towers and podium; reducing bulk.

Development Permit

Changes from rezoning broadly include:

- Architectural expression and articulation
- Planting configuration of the plaza
- Reshaping of the lobbies.
- Introduction of a band between the podium and tower.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

1. Does the proposal adequately respond to the Panel's concerns from the rezoning stage?
2. The evolution of the public plaza as an informal gathering space (approx. 400 people); its treatment and elements.
3. The proposed strategy to strengthen the Youth Centre's presence, identity and relationship to the plaza.
4. The overall architectural development and proposed strategy to reduce bulk and address the relationship between towers and the podium.
5. Any additional comments for consideration (e.g. storefront interface; lane interface; amenities).

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant gave a general overview of the project and followed by landscape strategy.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MS. THAKRE** and seconded by **MR. BONIFACE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

1. Design development to the plaza so that it can hold a greater range of activities.
2. Design development of the public realm including the canopy scale and street furnishings.

Panel Commentary

Summary:

- In general, the proposal responds to the rezoning stage.
- Plaza is challenging for the programs that are contemplated. Pull together the raised landscape planters to create larger pockets instead of small ones between the planters.
- The scale and design of the canopies requires development.
- There were mixed comments on the youth centre lobby; Some Panelists commented that it is effective and one Panelist commented on it being mis-sited.
- Some Panelists noted the tower and podium being too bulky.

Does the proposal adequately respond to the Panel's concerns from the rezoning stage?

- A Panelist noted the questions raised at the rezoning stage have not been successfully dealt with.
- Some Panelists noted positive changes from the rezoning stage but some moves don't coordinate nor integrate well.
- Bulk has not been addressed. It feels a rather full and bulky proposal especially with the way materials are used.

Public Plaza:

- Panel encourages further activation, programming and landscape design of the plaza.
- In general, Panel felt plaza space does not encourage gathering; does not currently meet its goal for a gathering space as recommended by the Plan. Three round benches do not provide a sufficient quantity of seating. To attract that many people into the space will require a more adequate stage for a public performance with more flexible seating arrangements.
- A Panelist encouraged using the plaza as a public performance space to attract more people.

- A Panelist noted the plaza does not engage the youth. It does not appropriately speak to the youth group that is to be a part of the place. The youth centre should be facing the plaza, not W 43rd. The youth have to potential to activate the plaza.

Youth Centre:

- A Panelist noted the entrance of the youth centre is mis-sited. Panelist recommends the entrance face the plaza rather than facing 43rd Ave.

Landscape:

- A Panelist suggested adding landscape to level five, creating dividers between the series of balconies.

Livability:

- A Panelist suggested improving the livability of the penthouse, as there are columns in the middle of the bedroom.

Amenities:

- The amenity spaces are very small. Outdoor amenity should be close to a bathroom and sink.

Sustainability strategies:

- A Panelist commended the applicant for meeting sustainability requirements.
- A Panelist noted concern for the material along the façade as proposed and recommends further design evolution.

Additional comments for consideration:

- A Panelist noted the proposal feels bulky with the way the continuous skin is conveyed and requires further design development.
- A Panelist noted there is a lack of resolution of the skin / canopy and signage / canopy connections.
- A Panelist noted the recessed balcony on the northwest corner of the office and the diagonal recessed slash should be a more formally integrated move.
- Some Panelists noted further design development to integrate the roof top screening with the building mass is required.
- A Panelist noted the recess on the storefront is an improvement to the front façade.
- A Panelist noted there needs to be further consideration for the bike rack. They are placed in front of the retail creating an awkward frontage. In addition, the series of timber benches in front would be challenging for retail. The Panelist recommended clustering the bicycles together so it is not forming a wall of bikes between retail and the sidewalk.
- A Panelist suggested further design development is required to where the building meets the ground.
- A Panelist noted the scale of the canopy and the integration at grade is at a civic scale. The Panelist noted multiple scales (civic and neighbourhood) would be more successful.
- Sunshades do not look convincing. They should be larger to be more effective.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

2. Address:	622-688 SW Marine Drive
Permit No.:	DP-2022-00326
Description:	To develop a mixed-use development, consisting of two towers at 28 and 32 storeys on top of two six-storey podiums separated with a mid-block break, consisting of 574 units of secured rental, 20% floor space below market, commercial at grade and a privately owned daycare on level 2; all over three levels of underground parking with 271 stalls, 641 bicycle stalls having vehicular access off 70th Ave. Total FSR is 6.84, and building height is 96.2 m (315 ft.).
Zoning:	CD-1
Application Status:	Complete Development Application
Review:	First (as DP)
Architect:	Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Delegation:	Mark Whitehead Byron Chard
Staff:	Derek Robinson

EVALUATION: 622-688 SW Marine Drive (DP) - Support with recommendations (5/0)

Derek Robinson, Development Planner, provided an overview of the site, the existing context, the previous UDP review of the rezoning, an overview of the proposal, and outlined the key rezoning conditions approved by Council. This was followed by the questions from staff to the panel.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Has the applicant successfully responded to the previous UDP recommendations and the following rezoning conditions:

1. Overall Tower Height

Rezoning conditions sought to achieve:

- step backs for the proposed amenity spaces on the top two levels of both towers
- Reducing the height and prominence of the tower top and mechanical enclosures to the greatest extent feasible

The policy intent is that the tower massing reads as clearly subordinate to the Marine Gateway tower with regard to overall height.

Are there opportunities to further refine and simplify the tower top treatment to achieve the above intent?

2. Enhanced Architectural Expression

Rezoning conditions sought to achieve:

- Incorporating an architectural gesture for each tower that responds to the orientation of the relevant secondary street

- Enhancing both tower lobbies to further highlight and distinguish the building entrance experiences
 - Differentiating the architectural language of the podium from that of the towers
- Are there opportunities to further enhance the architectural expression through detailed treatments and material application?**

3. Public Realm Interface

Rezoning conditions sought to achieve:

- High quality, durable, active and engaging urban elements, finishing treatments and materials
- Incorporating active uses which attract year-round users, including provision of additional covered spaces
- Enhancing the relationship between the public plaza and the adjacent uses at grade

Are there opportunities to enhance the public realm interface to further achieve a sense of safety, visual porosity and animation and to increase overall public accessibility?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The applicant gave a general overview of the project specifically on the height, architectural expression and public realm. They then presented on the landscape strategy for this project.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. LISTER** and seconded by **MS. THAKRE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Design development at the top of the tower through colour and form.
- 2) Integration of bike room and its relationship to sidewalk needs to be more strongly handled.

Panel Commentary

Summary:

- In general Panel noted support for the project.
- In general Panel noted concerns with the tower height relative to the Marine Gateway tower with sensitivity to the top of the tower. Some Panelists noted design development is required to the massing and colour to the top of the building. Some Panelists noted the building is too high in meeting the overall urban design objectives for the area and should be addressed.

Overall Tower Height

- Some Panelists noted further design development to the tower, making it subordinate to the tallest tower, currently the difference between the heights is imperceptible.
- A Panelist noted the top of the tower is not a clear resolution and the colour seems foreign to the rest of the project.
- A Panelist noted the large solid dark colour objects at the top of the tower is not helping much.
- Some Panelists noted the shape at the top of the building is heavy and bulky.

Architectural Expression and Public Realm

- In general, Panel was supportive of the architectural expression and public realm.
- Some Panelists noted the public realm and architectural expression needs design development, as there are many corners that are uncomfortable and unresolved.
- A Panelist noted the stepping of the façade and podium would look much cleaner like it does on the eastern tower.
- A Panelist noted the main connective stairs at the public realm needs design development. The stairs are elegant in its aspiration but it is actualized “rather rough”, it does not feel gracious.

- A Panelist noted the interior and exterior programming at the public realm is exemplary; the basketball court animating the space is great.
- A Panelist encouraged having public art integrated into the surfaces rather than taking up the pocket of spaces that have been created.
- Some Panelists suggested the connectivity to the sidewalk could be strengthen. A Panelist suggested animating the edge on the 70th St façade along the bike area.
- A Panelist suggested the planter walls on some of the townhomes on Ash St. is low enough so there is a notion of transition from public to private.
- A Panelist noted the material palette is heterogenous and requires refinement.

Sustainability

- A Panelist noted appreciation for the low carbon energy approach.
- A Panelist noted there is a lot of glazing on the southeast elevation. Panelist suggest incorporating extra shading to improve resiliency.
- A Panelist noted there is a lot of spandrel and glazing and suggest applicant look at enclosure performance and improving comfort.

Livability

- A Panelist encouraged family units of 3-4 bedrooms.
- A Panelist noted the units were rational and sensible size.

Applicant’s Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.

3. **Address:** 1477 W Broadway
Permit No.: DP-2022-00383
Description: To develop a 40-storey mixed-use residential building, with an 8-storey commercial podium containing office and grocery uses along with amenity space at rooftop 226 secured residential units (20% of which are to be moderate income units); all over Six storey of below grade parking having vehicular access from the existing lane, along with at grade transit station at the southwest corner of the site for the anticipated Broadway Subway project. Building height is approximately 128.6 m (422 ft.).
- Zoning:** C3-A to CD-1
Application Status: Complete Development Application
Review: First (as DP)
Architect: Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership
Delegation: Mark Whitehead
Peter Odegaard
- Staff:** Kevin Spaans, Michelle Lee-Hunt and David Cha

EVALUATION: 1477 W Broadway (DP) - Support with recommendations (4/1)

Planner's Introduction:

Development Planner, David Cha began by introducing that this is a Development Permit application following Rezoning for a 40-storey mixed-use tower including retail, office, and secured market rental residential uses. The building includes an integrated Broadway subway station, and was last reviewed by the Urban Design Panel on December 8, 2021. Mr. Cha further noted that the development falls within the Broadway Plan area, and was permitted to proceed to RZ application ahead of approval of the Plan because of critical construction deadlines for the integrated subway head house.

Mr. Cha presented the site context and the anticipated Broadway Plan at the immediate context, background history and the process given the complex project approvals process. He noted that the public realm design, and building footprint, has remained largely unchanged from the approved DP and the construction has now extended to approximately level three of the podium as per this design.

Mr. Cha noted that The UDP unanimously supported the subsequent rezoning proposal on December 8, 2021 with the following recommendations:

- Recommend the applicant work with staff to open up and significantly increase the public realm and increase the weather protection
- Reconsider the grocery store access, and
- Address the tapered stairs

Mr. Cha mentioned that Staff integrated the Urban Design Panel commentary into the rezoning conditions of approval, which had the following general themes:

- Improvements to the corner plaza to increase volumetric area, add visual interest, and better mark the corner
- Improvements to the “crown” of the building for stronger visual articulation from far aspects
- Improvements to the mid-level mechanical floor to better reinforce the architectural concept
- At Development Permit application: grocery store layout to support visual interest at all hours, materiality and detail

Corner Plaza and Public Realm

The pedestrian plaza at the southwest corner of the site marks the main point of entry into the subway station, and includes a commercial retail unit.

Mr. Cha presented the image that showed the proposed design response at the time of the rezoning, including a corner column clad in a placeholder public art installation. Mr. Cha also presented the image of the current proposed design response.

Mr. Cha noted that the formal Public Art process, which this rezoning is required to follow, precludes the applicant from pre-selecting the location, expression, or form of the art installation. The location of public art is recommended by an independent public art consultant in consultation with the chosen artist, and is ultimately approved by the Public Art Commission. Therefore, this column is required to perform as a high-quality architectural design element independent of the future installation of public art.

Articulation and Crown

With consideration given to the prominence of the building scale and location on the south side of False Creek, and to improve shadowing performance, Mr. Cha noted that staff conditioned further articulation of the tower massing at upper levels. Mr. Cha presented the image that showed the proposal at the time of the RZ application, and also the image that captured applicant’s response, with additional shoulder setbacks added from levels 37 to 40.

Mid-level Mechanical Floor

The application proposes to consolidate mechanical equipment largely to a mechanical level at the top of the podium. Mr. Cha noted that Staff recommended support of this design approach at the time of the rezoning with the condition the applicant undertake further design development to better integrate the expression of this level with the other building elements at the time of the DP, as this level is within the pedestrian line of sight from Granville Street. Mr. Cha presented the image from rezoning and the current application and noted that the current application is proposing only modest design changes.

Materiality and Detail

Mr. Cha noted that the applicant is proposing a mix of terracotta panels, glazing units, aluminum cladding, and reflective bronze as the primary material palette.

Advice from the Panel on this application is sought on the following:

Please comment on the application's response to the UDP recommendations on the Rezoning Application and the general themes of the Rezoning Conditions of Approval, as follows:

1. The proposed changes to the corner plaza, including the treatment of the column as a high-quality architectural feature within a high-volume pedestrian area;
2. The proposed architectural treatment of the podium, the intermediate mechanical level, and the tower, and;
3. The performance of the proposed material palette and detailing in reinforcing the architectural concept when viewed from near and distance aspects.

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Applicant presented the updates to the proposal focusing on the top and base of the tower. Then they gave an overview of the detailing and materiality of the façade.

Applicant and staff took questions from Panel.

Panel's Consensus on Key Aspects Needing Improvement:

Having reviewed the project, it was moved by **MR. ROMSES** and seconded by **MR. BONIFACE** and was the decision of the Urban Design Panel:

THAT the Panel Recommend Support with recommendations to the project with the following recommendations to be reviewed by City Staff:

- 1) Design development to the expression of the column and the upper grocery corner so it has space to breathe and will be artful.
- 2) Simplify the articulation of the office element at the podium.
- 3) Increase prominence and legibility of the grocery store entry.

Panel Commentary

Summary:

- In general, the Panel was not supportive of the proposed changes to the corner plaza including the column expression given the significance of the location.
- In general, the Panel noted the excessive articulation of the office component with layering and stepping design moves and recommend further design development to simplify the design moves which can make the podium and office expression much stronger.

- In general, the Panel noted the material palette and the de-saturated colour as a lost opportunity. Panel suggested a strength in colour would be welcomed.

Corner plaza and treatment to the column:

- In general, the Panel noted the column needs room to breath, as its currently crashing into the upper grocery store corner. Some Panelist noted that the grocery store needs to be pulled back more to fully express the column as an artful architectural form.
- The Panel noted the building is the gateway to the downtown; therefore, this corner needs to be much stronger and bolder with amazing piece of architecture that expresses how the building is supported.
- A panelist noted the corner plaza is currently underwhelming and mentioned that particular attention to the pedestrian scale as well as the city scale with high quality detailing is critical at this corner.
- A panelist suggested using the soffit to draw pedestrian attention.
- Some Panelists noted the column feels like it is competing for attention and disjointed from the rest of the architecture.
- A panelist noted the column is not helping with identifying the transit station. The bulk is reducing the visibility of the entryway.
- A panelist expressed concerns with the illumination around the column, as lighting that is not strategically designed will make it difficult to navigate for the visually impaired.

Grocery Store entry:

- A panelist noted there isn't a hierarchy of grocery store entry expression at the street level. The grocery store entry currently shares the same prominence and expression as the CRUs and the office lobby entrance and it should be more prominent.
- Some panelist noted that the grocery store entry is currently underwhelming. Design development to make the grocery store more prominent and consider a 2-storey expression as an entry for improved wayfinding to not rely solely on blade signage.

Office articulation:

- A panelist mentioned there are 3 different steps in the podium design and suggested strengthen the parti and simplifying the design moves.
- Some panelists noted that top layer expression of the office appear diluted and should be expressed as a four storey office box not a 3 and half storey expression.
- A panelist noted that there are too many unnecessary layers at the podium especially at the east of the podium.

Mechanical louvre:

- A panelist noted the appreciation for the high quality louvre and how it works as a reveal between tower and office. However, panelist noted there is an opportunity for something more playful and colourful to draw pedestrian's visual attention from the street.

Top of the Tower:

- A panelist noted the top of the tower is going to be seen for a life time from everywhere in the city and requires further design development. Panelist noted the stepping needs to be more readable.
- A panelist noted some improvements to the tower crown have been made since the rezoning.

Materiality:

- A panelist noted that the overall material palette is very muted.
- A panelist suggested making the base a much more muted palette so it is not competing with the signage.
- A panelist appreciates both the old and new material having some relationship to the context in the neighbourhood. Panelist encourage further design development of the metallic materials.
- Some panelists noted there is a de-saturation of material and the previous material palette had a much more distinct feel.
- A panelist noted the residential entries appear to have very dark areas in front of them, suggesting further design development of the colour of paving area in front.
- A panelist noted appreciation for the richer and warmer terracotta tone. Panelist encouraged the tower to not be as subdued as podium and take on a richer tone.

Accessibility concerns:

- A panelist suggested adjusting the bench seating adjacent to the bus stop. Panelist noted to integrate armrests into the bench design to be universal and so that the users can lift themselves up.
- A panelist noted there needs to be integrated safety measures for people using the accessible parking stalls.
- A panelist recommended significant colour contrast to the tapered stairs and include truncated tactile warning with colour contrast at the top of the stairs.
- A panelist concerned with the gap in-between the posts where the handrail is located which may cause tripping hazard.
- A panelist suggested further study of the highly reflective soffit material so that there is no significant glare shining down, as it can cause visual distraction and confusion for people with visual impairment.

Applicant's Response: The applicant team thanked the panel for their comments.